

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the present application. Claims 7-9, 11, 13, and 14-19 are amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 9 was objected to; Claims 7, 8, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 13-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; Claims 7-12 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form; and Claims 1-6 were allowed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. In view of that indication, Claims 7 and 8 have been amended as suggested in the outstanding Office Action to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. No new matter has been added.

Regarding the objection to Claim 9, Claim 9 has been amended as suggested in the outstanding Office Action without adding new matter. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 7, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 7 and 8 have been amended to be consistent with independent Claims 1 and 2, respectively, and Claim 14 has been amended to correct the antecedent basis. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 13-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Claims 13-19 have been amended to recite statutory subject matter without adding new subject matter. More specifically, independent Claims 13 and 14 have been amended to recite a computer program product for execution on a computer system. In addition, Applicants note that under MPEP § 2106 IV B 2(b), “a claimed computer-related process” is considered statutory if the process is

“limited to a practical application within the technological arts.” Further, MPEP § 2106 IV B 2(b)(ii) provides an example in which “a claimed process for digitally filtering noise employing the mathematical algorithm is statutory” when the mathematical algorithm itself is not statutory.

Similar to the above example, in the instant case, Claims 13 and 14 recite a computer program product directed to a bandwidth management method which, when executed by a computer system, determines the reservation and update of a requested bandwidth in a network in which a plurality of nodes, including two or more edge nodes connected to other networks or users, are connected by links.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 13 and 14 are computer-related processes limited to a practical application (reserving the requested bandwidth in a network with a plurality of nodes including two or more edge nodes connected to other network or users) in the technological arts as defined by MPEP § 2106 B 2. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended Claims 13-19 are directed to statutory subject matter and they are in condition for allowance.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Masayasu Mori
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 47,301
Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.
Limited Recognition No. L0037

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
MM/RFF:aif

I:\ATTY\RFF\21S\219859\219859US-AM.DOC